UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/561,368	12/20/2005	Hiroaki Koshima	281974US0PCT	9727
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET			EXAMINER	
			GOLOBOY, JAMES C	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1797	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/08/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/561,368	KOSHIMA ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	James Goloboy	1797		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D/ Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27 M</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3 and 6-14 is/are pending in the ap 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3 and 6-14 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.			
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate		

Application/Control Number: 10/561,368 Page 2

Art Unit: 1797

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment filed 3/27/09 overcomes the rejection over Meyer set forth in the office action mailed 10/29/08. However, the amended claims are rejection as obvious over Meyer. The rejections over Goodwine and Tipton are maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. Claims 1-3, 6-7, 12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyer.

In column 1 lines 56-63, Meyer discloses a detergent that is a mixture of N-substituted imides derived from adducts of maleic anhydride and olefins, which are then further reacted with amines. In columns 2-3 Meyer discloses that the maleic anhydride adducts have alkenyl groups of between 10 and 30 carbon atoms, meeting the limitations of reactant (a) of claim 1 and claim 6. In column 4 lines 8-47, Meyer discloses that the amine mixture contains aminoethylpiperazine, meeting the limitations of the ring-terminated amine of reactant (b) of claim 1 as well as claims 2-3. Examples 1-7 in columns 6-8 discloses the preparation of additives meeting the limitations of claims 1-3.

In Tables I, VII, and VIII, Meyer discloses that some of the alkenyl substituents of the succinimide have more than 30 carbon atoms. The succinimide products with these alkenyl substituents will have a molecular weight within the range recited in claim 7, and also meet the limitations of newly added claims 12 and 14. The difference between Meyer and the currently presented claims is that Meyer does not disclose a mole

Art Unit: 1797

percentage of polyalkylenepolyamine having a ring structure at an end within the range recited in claim 1.

Attention is drawn to the sample amine mixtures in Table IX (column 6 lines 34-47), which contain aminoethylpiperazine. While Meyer discloses the concentration in terms of weight percentage instead of mole percentage, it is clear that the amine mixtures in Table IX will meet the concentration limitation of reactant (b) of claim 1, as the "higher oligomers" that make up a large portion of the amine mixtures will have a higher molecular weight than the aminoethylpiperazine, and the mole percentage of aminoethylpiperazine in the mixtures will be greater than the weight percentage. The mole percentage of aminoethylpiperazine in the "Amine-A" mixture of Meyer will therefore overlap the range recited in claim 1. See MPEP 2144.05(I): "In the case where the claimed ranges "overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art" a prima facie case of obviousness exists. *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976);"

3. Claims 1-6 and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodwine.

This rejection is adequately set forth in paragraph 7 of the office action mailed 10/29/08, which is incorporated here by reference.

4. Claims 1-6 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tipton.

Art Unit: 1797

This rejection is adequately set forth in paragraph 8 of the office action mailed 10/29/08, which is incorporated here by reference.

5. Claims 1-3, 6-8, and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tiffany (U.S. Pat. No. 5,789,356) in view of Meyer.

Tiffany discloses a lubricating composition, as recited in claim 8, for two-stroke engines comprising a succinimide dispersant substituted by a C20-C60 olefin (column 5 lines 45-67), overlapping the range recited for the R1 group of claim 1, and a second succinimide dispersant substituted by a C60-C350 hydrocaryl group (column 8 lines 49-65), which will have a molecular weight within the range recited for component (B) of claims 7 and 13. In the table in column 12, Tiffany discloses that the two succinimides are added to the composition in similar amounts, and the relative concentrations therefore meet the limitations of claim 13. In column 11 lines 3-10, Tiffany discloses that the lubricant compositions are often added directly to the fuel. Tiffany does not specifically disclose a succinimide formed from a polyalkylenepolyamine having a ring structure.

The discussion of Meyer in paragraph 2 above is incorporated here by reference. Meyer discloses a succinimide dispersant with a similar molecular weight to the low molecular weight succinimide of Tiffany and meeting the limitations of the succinimide of claim 1. The use of the succinimide dispersant of Meyer as the low molecular weight dispersant in the composition of Tiffany meets the limitations of claims 1-3, 6-7, and 12-14.

Art Unit: 1797

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the dispersant of Meyer as the low molecular weight dispersant in the composition of Tiffany, as Tiffany teaches that the composition can be added directly to the fuel and Meyer teaches that the dispersant is also an effective detergent in fuels.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Goloboy whose telephone number is (571)272-2476. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on 571-272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/561,368

Page 6

Art Unit: 1797